THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S. RAO

WRIT PETITION No.22877 of 2006

06.11.2006

Between:

Peddapati Venkatalakshmi.

..Petitioner

And

State of Andhra Pradesh, represented by District Collector, East Godavari District, Kakinada. and others.

..Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S. RAO

WRIT PETITION No.22877 of 2006

ORDER:

The petitioner is aggrieved by the inaction of the Land Reforms Tribunal in disposing of her application filed under Rule 16(5)(b) of the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Rules, 1974 ("the Rules", for brevity). Therefore, this Writ Petition is filed seeking a direction to the second respondent to dispose of the application filed by the petitioner on 02.10.2006.

It is the case of the petitioner that the fifth respondent herein by order, dated 06.10.1976, was declared as holder of 1.0247 standard holdings, in excess of the ceiling limit under the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973. It appears, the appeal filed by the petitioner, being L.R.A.No.1108 of 1976, was allowed on 01.07.1978, directing deletion of one-twelfth share in survey Nos.962, 961/2 of Kothapalli Village and survey Nos.197/1 and 197/2 of Madhurapudi Village. The petitioner and her father were declared entitled to one-twelfth share each, which is to be excluded according to the petitioner. Therefore, while the surrender proceedings were on, she filed the application under Rule 16(5) of the Rules.

Learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue (General-A) submit that the case now stands posted to 18.11.2006. In view of this, without expressing opinion on the claim of the petitioner for exclusion of one-twelfth share in the land in survey numbers mentioned hereinabove, the second respondent is directed to dispose of the application of the petitioner on 18.11.2006, without any further adjournment. The expeditious disposal of the petitioner's application, as ordered herein, would be appropriate redressal for her at present. If any adverse order is passed by the second respondent, it shall be open to her to prefer an appeal before the Land Reforms Appellate Tribunal, Kakinada.

The Writ Petition, with the above observation and direction, is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

_____

(V.V.S.RAO, J)

06.11.2006

GJ